

1
2
3
4 DARRYL LEE GOLDSTEIN,
5 Plaintiff,
6 v.
7 GEORGINA BARAJAS, et al.,
8 Defendants.

9 Case No. [19-cv-00555-HSG](#)
10
11

12
13 **ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

14 On January 31, 2019, Plaintiff filed the instant *pro se* complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
15 Dkt. No. 1. On July 24, 2019, the Court dismissed the complaint with leave to amend because it
16 did not comply with Rule 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in that it alleged unrelated
17 claims against different sets of defendants and because of other deficiencies. Dkt. No. 18.
18 Plaintiff was instructed to file an amended complaint by August 21, 2019, and informed that the
19 failure to do so would result in the dismissal of this action without further notice. *Id.* The Court
20 granted plaintiff two extensions of time to December 2, 2019, to file an amended complaint. Dkt.
21 Nos. 21, 24. The deadline to file an amended complaint has passed, and plaintiff has not filed an
22 amended complaint and has not communicated with the Court since September 12, 2019, *see* Dkt.
23 No. 23.¹

24 //

25 //

26 _____
27 ¹ It appears that plaintiff's address has changed, but that he has not informed the Court of his new
28 address as required by N.D. Cal. L.R. 3-11. Pursuant to Local Rule 3-11, the Court may, without
prejudice, dismiss a complaint when mail directed to the *pro se* party by the Court has been
returned to the Court as not deliverable; and the Court fails to receive within sixty (60) days of this
return a written communication from the *pro se* party indicating a current address. Mail sent to
plaintiff was returned as undeliverable on October 31 and November 8, 2019. Dkt. Nos. 25, 26.

1 Accordingly, this action is DISMISSED. The Clerk shall close the file.
2

IT IS SO ORDERED.

3 Dated: 12/3/2019
4


5 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
6 United States District Judge
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28